

The Effect of Structured Jigsaw Technique and Unstructured Group Work on The Listening Achievement of Junior High School Students

Agustin Santoso

Abstract. Nowadays, English has been used as the most important foreign language in Indonesia. Many schools have used it as their important subject to be taught to the students. The English teaching can cover 4 language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing, all of them are important, especially listening. Listening is not an easy subject to master. It needs the teacher's role in teaching that skill. In this study, the writer would like to know whether there is a significant difference between the listening achievement of learners taught by using structured jigsaw technique and unstructured group work technique, especially in answering the three types of questions.

The writer took the data from St. Clara Junior High School and the population is the second grade students. The writer took VIII B as the control group and VIII C as the experimental group. The writer administered pretest before the treatment to see the level of the students' listening ability. After that, she conducted three times treatment by using structured jigsaw technique in the experimental group and unstructured group work in the control group. The posttest was administered and then the writer analyzed the mean scores by using t-test.

From the analysis of the pretest, the writer found out that those two groups had equal ability in listening achievement. From the posttest scores, the writer also found out that those two groups were not significantly different. It means that the null hypothesis which says "There is no significant difference in listening achievement between the second grade Junior High School students who are taught using jigsaw technique and those who are taught using unstructured group work" was accepted. Further analysis found that jigsaw technique could improve the students' listening ability in answering main idea questions.

Key terms: ability, listening achievement, skills, jigsaw, group work, control group, experimental group, pretest, posttest, t-test

Introduction

Traditional method is used by many English teachers in Indonesia when they teach English in classroom, including in listening class. The traditional listening class conducted by teachers is usually carried out by providing the students oral text and the teachers usually directly lead the discussion. It usually tends to be teacher-centered. The students seldom interact actively in this condition. What happens next is that the students

do not get used to share their ideas or help each other to understand about the materials they get.

As stated by Nichols in Bentley (1998), "The most basic of all human needs is to understand and to be understood... the best way to understand people is to listen to them." Listening is something that people learn first in their life. When a baby was born, he listened to his mom saying everything. He learned vocabularies and he also learned to speak. That's why listening and teaching listening is very important.

As Kaplan (2002) states, constructivism proposes that learning environment should support multiple interpretations of reality, knowledge construction as well as context-rich and experience-based activities. Since English learners need more practice to make their English fluent, teachers are expected to lead their students to be active in teaching learning process. The students do not just listen and keep silent, but they should learn through interaction with their fellow students, teachers, and families or in other word, they should be active. The teachers do not merely transfer their knowledge to their students.

The English teachers play the most important role to make their students active in English class. The teachers have to try hard to succeed their effort in helping the students active because the students do not get used to share their ideas or help each other to understand about the materials they get. Many teachers try to make their class more active by increasing the interaction among students. One way based on the fifth principle in Constructivist Learning Theory (2002) to apply constructivism theory that will help the English teachers increase student-student interaction is performing jigsaw technique in teaching. Our learning is intimately associated with our connection with other human beings, our teacher, our peers, our family, as well as casual acquaintances.

In jigsaw, there will be two teams: expert team and home team. The students are expected to learn from their fellow students to master the materials they get when they are in expert team. When they go back to their home team, they learn to teach one another the material they have worked on in expert team. If each student's part is essential, then each student is essential. That is precisely what makes this strategy so effective (Aronson, 2005).

Some studies related to the implementation of jigsaw technique in language classes have been carried out. Most of them have been implemented in reading classes. For example, a study conducted by Kurnia (2002) and Tamah et al (2007). Though many studies have been done, more studies need to be conducted in other skills, for example in listening skill. Since the writer wants to know the effect of that technique on the SLTP students' listening achievement, she conducts this research.

The Problem Statement

Based on the background stated previously, there will be two kinds of questions: one major question and three minor questions.

The major question:

“Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of second grade Junior High School students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work?”

The minor questions:

“Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering factual questions?”

“Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering inference questions?”

“Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering main idea questions?”

The Objective of the Study

Through this experimental study, the writer wants to find out if there is a significant difference between the listening achievement of learners taught by using jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work technique. Besides that, she also wants to know the difference between the learners' ability taught by using jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work technique in answering three types of questions.

Research Method

In order to answer the research questions set forth in section 1.2 as one way to achieve the objective stated in section 1.3, the writer has carried out certain methodological activities.

Research Design

This study is a quantitative study and employs a quasi-experiment which will apply a non-randomized pre-posttest control group design. The writer was not allowed to randomize the students. There are two variables in this study, a dependent variable and an independent variable. The dependent variable of this study is second grade of Junior High School students' listening achievement and the independent variable of this study is the technique that is used by the teacher in the listening class, both experimental group and control group. The teacher implementing jigsaw technique and unstructured group work is the writer herself. This study is conducted with the research design as follows:

Population and Sample

The population of this study was the second grade students of St. Clara Junior High School Surabaya. The samples of this study were the students from two classes namely VIIIA, VIIIB and VIIC. VIIIA was the pilot group and it was a small class. VIIIB and VIIC classes consisted of 48 students. The writer took class VIIC as the experimental group and class VIIIB as the control group. The writer conducted this study to second grade Junior High School students because the writer believed that they had gotten some experiences in listening class and working in groups when they were in the first grade.

Treatments

Each group got different treatment. Class VIIC as the experimental group got jigsaw technique as the treatment and class VIIIB as the control group got unstructured group work as the treatment. The similarities of both groups were the students were asked to make groups and then they listened and discussed the material in group. Beside that, both groups got same material and time limitation for the discussion. The differences between those groups were the students in experimental group recognized 'home and expert teams' and the roles in the groups while for the students in control group, they did not recognize 'home and expert teams'. There was no role applied in the groups. Below are the treatments done in the experimental and control groups.

Research Instrument

A listening comprehension test was developed for this study. The same listening comprehension test was used for the pretest and posttest for both experimental and control group. Firstly, it consisted of 54 items. Since some of the questions were poor, the writer dropped them. Now, it consisted of 37 items for the research instrument. It was in the form of multiple choice questions each of which had four options. Those questions consist of three kinds of questions, factual, inference, and main idea questions.

The pretest and posttest were scored by the writer manually. It would be divided into two. The first one was the score for answering the major research question. The writer scored the pretest and the posttest as a whole. There were 37 multiple choice questions in the text. Since the total score was 100 for all correct answers, one correct answer was scored 2.7. The highest score the students could achieve would be 100.

The second one was for answering the minor questions. There were 37 items consisting 15 factual questions, 14 inference questions, and 8 main idea questions. The score of each of them was one. Therefore, the highest score for the factual questions was 15, for the inference questions was 14, and the highest score for the main idea questions was 8.

Data Analysis Procedure

The writer used the score of the pretest and posttest as the data for this study. In analyzing the mean of the students' scores, the writer used the *t-test* formula. The *t-test* formula-*t-test for significance of the difference between two means for independent samples* as suggested in Hatch and Lazaraton (1991:261)-was used. At first, the writer analyzed the MID test scores to see whether the students were at the same level. The MID test consisted of reading skill, writing skill, listening skill, grammar, and also vocabulary. Since she wanted to make sure that the students of both classes were equal only in the listening achievement, she conducted a pretest. The result was that the students of both classes were equal in the listening achievement.

After conducting three times treatments, the writer administered a posttest to both groups. Next, the writer analyzed the posttest scores of both the experimental and control groups to determine whether there was a significant difference between them. If the result of the analysis was non-significant, the *t-test* would be employed. The statistical computation, either gain scores or covariance would be employed if the result of the analysis was in significant answer.

For answering the minor research questions, the writer also did the same thing to the scores of factual, inference, and main idea questions both from the pre and posttest. She employed the *t-test* because there was no significant difference.

Data Analysis and Findings

Data Analysis

Answering the major research questions, "Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of second grade Junior High School students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work?", the writer did some analysis.

First, the writer asked permission to have the students' score of MID test to see whether the two groups were equal in English ability. The *t-test* was used to analyze their scores.

The Result of t-test for the MID test Scores

Variables	Mean	Sig. Value	Conclusion ($\alpha = .05$)
Experimental Group	73.81	.785	Not Significant
Control Group	80.34		

It was clearly indicated in table that the mean of the Experimental group was 73.81 while the Control group was 80.34. It is shown that the exact significance obtained for the MID test score was .785 (See Appendix 12 and 13 for the detailed calculation). Since $p .785$ was greater than .05 (the level of significance determined), the null hypothesis was

accepted; the MID test mean scores between the two groups were not significantly different. It can be concluded that the two groups were equal in their English ability before the treatments were done.

The *t-test* of the pretest scores of the two groups proved similar result. The table below is presented as the summary of the *t-test* calculation.

The Result of t-test for the Pretest Scores

Variables	Mean	Sig. Value	Conclusion ($\alpha = .05$)
Experimental Group	83.77	.077	Not Significant
Control Group	81.02		

It was clearly indicated in table that the mean of the Experimental group was 83.77 while the Control group was 81.02. It is shown that the exact significance obtained for the pretest score was .077 (See Appendix 16 for the detailed calculation). Since $p .077$ was greater than .05 (the level of significance determined), the null hypothesis was accepted; the pretest mean scores between the two groups were not significantly different.

Since both groups were of more or less the same level as proved statistically above, the last calculation was done to the posttest scores of the two groups. The posttest scores were analyzed statistically using *t-test* for significance of the difference between two means for independent samples as suggested in Hatch and Lazaraton (1991:261). The summary of the *t-test* analysis of the data of the posttest scores is shown below.

The Result of t-test for the Posttest Scores

Variables	Mean	Sig. Value	Conclusion ($\alpha = .05$)
Experimental Group	85.82	.261	Not Significant
Control Group	87.23		

From table, it could be seen clearly that the mean of the Experimental group was 85.82 while the Control group was 87.23. The exact significance obtained for the posttest score was .261 (See Appendix 16 for the detailed calculation). Since $p .261$ was greater than .05 (the level of significance determined), the null hypothesis was accepted; the posttest mean scores between the two groups were not significantly different.

Findings

The finding related to the major research question was obtained from the analysis by using *t-test*. The null hypothesis which says: "There is no significant difference between the listening achievement of second grade of Junior High School students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work.", was accepted. The alternative hypothesis was not confirmed. Jigsaw

technique did not influence the listening achievement of the second grade of Santa Clara Junior High School.

Data Analysis and Findings to the Minor Research Questions

Data Analysis

The minor questions of this study are:

“Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering factual questions?”

“Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering inference questions?”

“Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering main idea questions?”

The writer used *t-test* to analyze the data obtained from the pre and posttests. The writer used the posttest scores of the two groups to answer the minor questions.

The t-test Computation for the Factual Question Scores

Variables	Mean	Sig. Value	Conclusion ($\alpha = .05$)
Experimental Group	13.48	.575	Not Significant
Control Group	13.55		

As seen as in table the mean of factual question for experimental group was 13.48 while for the control group was 13.55. Since p (.575) was greater than .05, the null hypothesis was accepted; the factual question mean scores of the listening test of the two groups were not significantly different. (See Appendix 17 for detail calculation).

The same calculation was used to analyze the mean of inference question score. The calculation was presented in table 4.5 below.

The t-test Computation for the Inferential Question Scores

Variables	Mean	Sig. Value	Conclusion ($\alpha = .05$)
Experimental Group	12.00	.898	Not Significant
Control Group	11.91		

It is clearly indicated that in table that the mean of inference question score for experimental group was 12.00 and for control group was 11.91. Since p (.898) was greater than .05, the null hypothesis was accepted; the inferential question mean scores of the listening test of the

two groups were not significantly different. (For detail calculation, see Appendix 17)

The t-test Computation for the Main Idea Scores

Variables	Mean	Sig. Value	Conclusion ($\alpha = .05$)
Experimental Group	6.33	.003	Not Significant
Control Group	6.87		

From table it could be seen that the mean of main idea question for experimental group was 6.33 while for control group was 6.87. Since p (.003) was smaller than .05, the null hypothesis was not accepted; the main idea mean scores of the listening test of the two groups were significantly different. (See Appendix 17 for detail calculation)

Findings

The null hypothesis for factual question which says: "There is no significant difference between the ability of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering factual questions.", was accepted. The null hypothesis for inference question which says: "There is no significant difference between the ability of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering inference questions.", was also accepted.

Unlike the null hypothesis of the factual and inference questions, the null hypothesis of the main idea question which says: "There is no significant difference between the ability of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering main idea questions.", was not accepted. The alternative hypothesis for main idea question which says: "There is significant difference between the ability of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering main idea questions.", was accepted. There was a different listening achievement between the students of the experimental group and the students of the control group in answering the main idea question.

Discussion of the Findings

Discussion of the Findings Related to the Major Research Question

The major research question of this study says "Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of second grade Junior High School students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work?" The data analysis proved that there was no significant difference in listening achievement between the students taught by using structured Jigsaw technique and those taught by using unstructured group work. It showed

that Jigsaw technique did not improve the students' listening achievement.

A possible cause why the result found was not significant is that jigsaw is a new technique for the students. They might need more time to adapt to this technique since there were only three times treatments carried out. Although they have known how to work in groups, they still did not get used to working in expert team and home team.

Another cause is related to the students' seriousness, especially in working in the expert and home teams. Some students might not be serious when they discussed in their groups. It might influence the other students to be lacking in enthusiasm in joining the discussion.

Besides that, the number of the students in one class is also one of the causes. There were 48 students in one class. It was quite difficult for one teacher to monitor a big class, especially using jigsaw technique.

It was different from the students in experimental group. The control group students were more serious in working in their group. They were also serious in doing their posttest. The students in control group could be controlled easier than the students in experimental group. Another cause is that the students chose their own friends to work in groups. That is why there was 7.66% improvement in the mean score of their posttest compared to their pretest. The mean of the pretest score was 81.02 and the mean of their posttest score was 87.23.

Although there was no significant difference between their listening achievements, the mean of their posttest increased. The mean of their pretest scores was 83.77 and the mean of their posttest scores was 85.82. There was 2.45% improvement in their scores. It is because of the students started getting used to jigsaw technique at the second and third meetings. They started enjoying it but three times treatments were not enough.

Discussion of the Findings Related to the Minor Questions

Related to data analysis of the first minor research questions saying "Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering factual questions?", the null hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant difference in the listening achievement between the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and those taught by using unstructured group work. It seemed that jigsaw technique did not help them improve their listening capability in answering factual questions.

Based on the data analysis of the second minor research questions saying "Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering inference questions?", the null hypothesis was also accepted. No significant difference found in the listening achievement between the

students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and those taught by using unstructured group work. It can be seen that jigsaw technique did not help them improve their listening capability in answering inference questions.

Although there was no significant difference between the students' listening capability taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering factual and inference questions, their posttest scores increased 2.68% for factual questions and 3.04% for inference questions. For factual questions, the pretest score was 13.13 and their posttest was 13.48 while inference questions increased from 11.65 became 12.00.

It might be caused by the students' motivation that had just increased at the second treatment. They started to get used to answering factual and inference questions. It made the students' score increase.

For the data analysis of the third minor research questions saying "Is there a significant difference between the listening achievement of the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and the one of those taught by using unstructured group work in answering main idea questions?", the null hypothesis was not accepted. There was significant difference in the listening achievement between the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and those taught by using unstructured group work. Their listening ability in answering main idea questions were improved through jigsaw technique.

One possible reason is that most of the students had gotten used to answering or finding the main idea of the passage or the paragraphs. When they got jigsaw technique, they practiced more. That is why there was significant difference between the students taught by using structured jigsaw technique and those taught by using unstructured group work.

Conclusion

As we know, nowadays most of people in Indonesia use English as their second language. English has become an important subject taught in school. There are 4 language skills, listening, reading, speaking, and writing, in English. Students are able to be helped to master other skills by mastering one skill. It also happens in listening. By mastering listening skill, students can be helped to master other skills. Listening is not an easy subject to master. Mastering listening skill can be done by doing several techniques.

Some studies have focused on some techniques that can be applied in listening class. Some of them discussed about the implementation of jigsaw technique, but there were no real application. Because of that reason, the writer conducted this study to apply the technique in a real listening class of junior high school students, especially the second grade. Beside that, the writer wanted to prove the effectiveness of this technique to the students' listening achievement. The writer chose the second grade

because the writer believed that the students had gotten some experiences in listening class when they were in the first grade.

The population of this study was the second grade students of SMPK St. Clara Surabaya. The samples of this study were students of VIIIC as experimental group and VIIIB as control group.

The writer conducted the treatments to both groups. Each group got different technique. The one that was applied in the experimental group was jigsaw technique and the one that was applied in the control group was unstructured group work. Before giving the treatments, the writer conducted the pretest to those two groups. The pretest itself was tried out first in the other parallel class before it was distributed to those two groups. After getting the pretest, the students were given the treatments. After the third treatments, the posttest was administered. The theme for pretest, treatments, and posttest were the same, which was descriptive text. The writer also collected the mid-score for English subject of the samples from their English teacher.

From the analysis by using *t-test*, the writer found out that those two groups have equal ability in listening achievement. After that, the writer analyzed the posttest scores to prove if jigsaw technique brought a positive effect to their listening achievement or not. The writer also used *t-test* to analyze the posttest scores. From the analysis, the writer found that null hypothesis saying "There is no significant difference in listening achievement between second grade junior high school students who are taught using jigsaw technique and those who are taught using unstructured group work" was accepted. It means that jigsaw technique did not give great contributions to the students' listening achievement, in this case the second grade of junior high school. But at least, this technique could improve a little bit of students' listening achievement. It can be proved from the gain between the pretest mean score and the posttest mean score. The one in experimental group increased 2.45% and the one in control group increased 7.66%. It means that the one in experimental group increased more than the one in the control group.

Suggestions

The writer realized that this study was not perfect. There were some reasons that need more attention. For that reason, the writer would like to share some recommendations for the next studies which have the same topic with this study.

St. Clara Junior High School had big classes. One class consisted of at more or less 48 students. It was a really big class. The writer would like to suggest other researchers who want to implement jigsaw technique in real classes to choose a school which does not have many students in one class, for example there are maximum 20 students in one class.

If there are many classes for one grade, the writer should choose some classes which have more or less the same level in English. Before the research is started, it is better to give a kind of test among the control,

experimental, and pilot groups to see whether they were equal in English achievement. Another way is that the writer can take the students' MID test score.

In the implementation, the students spent so much time in the expert team discussion. They couldn't hear the listening scripts clearly because there were some problems with the recorders. It is better for the writer to pay more attention to the quality of the recorders so that the implementation can run well.

Another problem is sometimes the students talked about other things during the discussion. They discussed the material when the teacher stood up near them. To solve this problem, the writer recommends that it will be better if there are two teachers handling the class.

In this study, the writer only gave three times treatments. To overcome this problem, it is better to provide more treatments. For example, it is better for the researcher to give four or five treatments to the students. It is done to give chance for the students to enjoy and get used to the technique conducted. The researcher will see more improvement in the students' listening achievement.

The writer would like to suggest the next researcher to make sure that the students do the pretest and posttest seriously. The researcher may say that the score of the tests will be given to their English teacher and will be included in their report score. This strategy really worked when the writer conducted her study in SMPK St. Clara. The students really did the pretest and posttest seriously.

Related to the listening script for the treatments, the next researcher should pay attention to the genre of the text. It is better to choose a text which can be divided into some independent paragraphs. That kind of text is more suitable for jigsaw technique.

All in all, this study was not perfect and it had some weaknesses. That is why other studies which have the same topic need to be conducted. We can get more valid and accurate conclusion by having those other studies.

Bibliography

- Aronson, Elliot. 2005. *Jigsaw Classroom*. Retrieved on 3 October 2005 from <http://www.jigsaw.org> 2000-2005
- Aronson, Elliot. 2006. *Jigsaw Basics*. Retrieved on 9 February 2006 from <http://www.jigsaw.org/tips.htm> 2000-2006
- Aronson, Elliot. 2007. *Jigsaw Classroom*. Retrieved on March 16th 2007 from <http://www.jigsaw.org> 2000-2007
- Bentley, Sheila C. 1998. *Listening better: a guide to improving what may be the ultimate staff skill*. Retrieved April 28, 2007, from [Nursing Homes, Feb, 1998: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3830/is_n2_v47/ai20465585](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3830/is_n2_v47/ai20465585)

- Brown, Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Brown, James Dean. 1996. *Testing in Language Programs*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Coelho, Elizabeth. 1991. *Jigsaw*. Revised ed. Markham, Ontario: Pippin Publishing Ltd.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2001. *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Pengarang.
- Epstein, Maureen. 2002. *Constructivism*. Retrieved on 20 November 2007 from <http://tiger.towson.edu/users/mepste1/researchpaper.htm>
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1982. *Constructing Achievement Tests* (third ed.) New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Harlim, Lilyana. 1999. *Cooperative Learning using Jigsaw as A Technique in Teaching Listening Comprehension*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala.
- Hatch, Evelyn and Anne Lazaraton. 1991. *The Research Manual Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Indahwati, Ignasia Maria. 1998. *The Effect of Group Work and the Traditional Reading*
- Kaplan, Eitan. 2002. *Constructivism as a Theory*. Retrieved 20 November 2004 from <http://online.sfsu.edu/~foreman/itec800/finalprojects/eitankaplan/pages/classroom>
- Kessler, Carolyn, (ed.). 1992. *Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Kitao, S. & Kitao, K. (1996). *Testing Listening*. Retrieved April 18, 2007, from The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. II, No. 7, July 1996: <http://iteslj.org/>
- Kristinsdóttir, Sólrún B. 2001. *Constructivist Theories*. Retrieved on 20 November 2007 from <http://starfolk.khiis/solrun/construc.htm>
- Kurnia, Evy. 2002. *The Effect of Using Cooperative Learning by Using Jigsaw Activities and the Traditional Technique on the Listening comprehension Achievement of SMU YPPI-1 Students*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala.
- Nunan, David. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

- Olsen, J. W-B 1984. *Look Again Pictures for Lifeskills and Language Development*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.
- Purnomo, Ninik Erni. 1996. *The Correlation Between the Achievements of Extensive Reading, Structure, and Listening Comprehension, and the Achievement of Dictation*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala.
- Sannia. 1998. *The Effect of Cooperative Learning on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of SMU Kristen Petra 3 Students*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala.
- Tamah, Siti Mina, Ellisa Yani Widjaja, Linda Anggraiani and Ong Ervina Larissa Susanto. 2007. *The Implementation of Jigsaw Technique in Reading Class of Young Learners*. Surabaya: Unpublished Research Widya Mandala.
- Thanasoulas, Dimitrios. 2002. *Constructivism*. Retrieved on 20 November 2007 from [http://www.seasite.niu.edu/Tagalog/Teachers_Page/Language Learning_Article/constructivist_learning.htm](http://www.seasite.niu.edu/Tagalog/Teachers_Page/Language_Learning_Article/constructivist_learning.htm)

----- gunting dan kirimkan ke alamat Tata Usaha FKIP atau fax. (031) 3891267 -----

FORMULIR BERLANGGANAN JURNAL “MAGISTER SCIENTIAE”

Mohon dicatat sebagai pelanggan Jurnal “Magister Scientiae”

Nama : _____

Alamat : _____

(Kode Pos _____)

Harga langganan mulai Januari 2003 :

❖ Rp. 30.000,00 untuk 1 tahun

❖ Rp. 50.000,00 untuk 2 tahun

❖ Rp. 70.000,00 untuk 3 tahun

_____, _____

(_____)

Formulir Ini Boleh Difotokopi

BERITA PENGIRIMAN UANG LANGGANAN

Dengan ini saya kirimkan uang sebesar :

☐

Rp. 30.000,00 untuk langganan 1 tahun, mulai Nomor Tahun

☐

Rp. 50.000,00 untuk langganan 2 tahun, mulai Nomor Tahun

☐

Rp. 70.000,00 untuk langganan 3 tahun, mulai Nomor Tahun

Uang tersebut telah saya kirimkan melalui :

☐

Bank “***Mandiri***”, rekening Nomor **140 - 0002281773**, ^{a/n} Ig. Harjanto

☐

Pos Wesel dengan Resi nomor tanggal